



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,081	06/27/2003	Paul Fry	PDHO014	7449
21322	7590	12/29/2004	EXAMINER	
MARK A OATHOUT 3701 KIRBY DRIVE, SUITE 960 HOUSTON, TX 77098			DOUGLAS, STEVEN O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3751	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/609,081	FRY, PAUL
Examiner	Art Unit	
Steven O. Douglas	3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 16-18,20 and 22 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) 19 and 21 is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10282003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 16-22, drawn to an apparatus for filling reactor tubes, classified in class 141, subclass 18.
- II. Claims 1-15, drawn to a method for filling reactor tubes, classified in class 141, subclass 1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II. and I. are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such as a process not requiring the dispensing of catalyst into reactor tubes at different rate (see claim 1, lines 4 and 5) or automatically measuring catalyst by weight.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Mark Oathout on 12-20-04 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I., claims 16-22. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims

1-15 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Engert'349 et al.

The Engert et al. reference discloses a catalyst filler comprising plural hoppers (1,2), plural moving devices (see unlabeled hoppers where hoppers 1,2 are mounted into), plural catalyst dispensers (6,7), plural catalyst dispensers (4,5) with associated unlabeled scales and a programmable computer (Pr).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18,20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engert et al. (supra) in view of Comardo'157.

The Engert et al. reference discloses a catalyst filler (supra), but does not disclose use of a gate or door associated with the catalyst dispensers or moving devices. The Comardo reference discloses another catalyst filler having a computer controlled gate or door 406 associated with a catalyst dispenser to control the discharge of catalyst from the dispenser which is widely known in the dispenser art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Engert et al. device to incorporate a gate or door in view of the teachings of the Comardo reference to control the discharge of catalyst from the associated dispensers.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Magin et al. and Lytton et al. references pertain to other catalyst fillers with associated dispensers and movers.

Claims 19 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven O. Douglas whose telephone number is (571) 272-4885. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 6:00-6:30.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Steven O. Douglas
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751

SD
12-22-04